REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 4, 12, and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, and 19 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19, and 21 remain pending.

The specification has been amended pursuant to the examiner's request in paragraph 2 of the current Office Action.

Claims 17-19 have been amended to depend from claim 16.

Claim 8 has been amended pursuant to the objection in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

In the present Office Action, claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coleman et al. (U.S. 4,562,436; hereinafter "Coleman"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits each of the currently pending claims are patentable over the cited art.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method which includes:

"transmitting data via a first transmitter, wherein said data comprises:

a first data comprising a test pattern; and

a second data, wherein said second data comprises a first portion of an identifier which corresponds to said first transmitter;

receiving the first data and said second data at a first receiver;

transmitting a first feedback data from said first receiver to said first transmitter, in response to determining said first data is correct, wherein said first feedback data is selected to be equal to said second data;

transmitting a second feedback data from said first receiver to said first transmitter, wherein said second feedback data is not equal to said first feedback data, in response to determining said first data is not correct."

Applicant submits the cited art neither teaches nor suggests of the limitations are recited above. In contrast, Coleman teaches a type of GPIB protocol wherein transmitted data is augmented with a check word. Upon receiving the transmitted data, the receiver computes a check word and compares it to the received check word. If the computed and received check words match, the receiver generates a positive acknowledgement (ACK). If the computed and received check words do not match, the receiver generates a negative acknowledgement (NAK). In particular, Coleman teaches the following:

> "Within the framework of the GPIB protocol, a controller (sender) and listeners (receivers) communicate via a second-level protocol. The diagram of FIG. 57 is utilized to explain this secondary parallel bus protocol. Messages transferred over the GPIB data lines D0- D7 comprise a check word (CRC-8 polynomial in the illustrative embodiment) followed by the series of data bytes comprising the actual message. After the entire augmented message has been received by a listener or listeners, the receiving software computers [sic] a check value and compares it to the check word in the message. If the word and value match, a positive-acknowledgement (ACK) is transmitted to the sending side. If there is no match, some data error occurred and a negative acknowledgement (NACK) is transmitted to the sending side.
>
> The T/L/C side transmits an ACK to the T/L side by sending a single zero byte (OxOO) . . . A NACK is transmitted by sending a single nonzero byte to the minor address.
>
> The T/L side transmits positive and negative acknowledgements via its serial poll register, represented by device 715 in FIG. 57. One bit is assigned to each type of acknowledgement and these are depicted by bit positions 4 and 3, respectively, in poll register 715. The controller software responds to the ACK/NACK message when it polls each T/L circuit 710 in the usual fashion as set forth in the GPIB protocol standard (IEEE-488)."(Coleman, col. 75, lines 7-41).

It is also noted that Coleman discusses computers including identifiers which may be included in the messages as depicted in Fig. 6. However, it is noted that this teaching is unrelated to the GPIB protocol.

From the above it is seen that Coleman teaches data bytes are augmented with a CRC (check word) when transmitted. The receiver re-computes the CRC and compares the re-computed CRC to the CRC which was received. If the CRC values match (i.e., the data bytes were presumably received uncorrupted), then an ACK is generated. If the CRC values do not match, then the a NACK is generated. In the case of the controller (T/L/C), an ACK is a single zero byte 0x00, and a NACK is a single non-zero byte. For a receiver, a single bit is reserved in the poll register for each of an ACK (bit 4) and a NACK (bit 3).

It is first noted that Coleman does not teach the data as transmitted in claim 1. Claim 1 recites that the data comprises "a first data comprising a test pattern; and a second data, wherein said second data comprises a first portion of an identifier which corresponds to said first transmitter." In contrast, Coleman teaches a data which includes (1) data bytes which are augmented with (2) a CRC.

Further, Coleman does not teach or suggest "transmitting a first feedback data from said first receiver to said first transmitter, in response to determining said first data is correct, wherein said first feedback data is selected to be equal to said second data." Rather, Coleman teaches generating an ACK consisting of the single byte zero 0x00.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, because claim 9 includes features similar to that of claim 1, claim 9 and its dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance as well.

In addition to the above, claim 16 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 16 also recites "a first data comprising a test pattern; and a second data, wherein said second data comprises a first portion of an identifier which corresponds to said first transmitter" which are not taught or suggested by Coleman. Also, claim 16 teaches a first receiver coupled to said first transmitter, wherein said first receiver is configured to: transmit a second feedback data to said first transmitter, wherein said second feedback data is not equal to said first feedback data and is selected to be equal to the complement of said second data, in response to determining said first data is not correct." As noted

above, Coleman teaches generating a NACK which consists of either a single non-zero byte, or a single set bit in a specific poll register location. Accordingly, claim 16 and its dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant also notes the objection to the inventor Declaration wherein the inventor's address information is missing. Included herein is a newly executed Declaration including all of the inventor's information.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-91500/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

☒ Supplemental Declaration

Respectfully submitted,

Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 8/27/04